

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

C.R.No.3320 of 2006

DATE OF ORDER: 13.2.2007

Adhiraj Kanwar

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Smt Seonki Devi and others

....Respondent(s)

CORUM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. AGGARWAL

.*.*.*.

Present: Mr. Arvind Singh, Advocate.
 Mr. R.S. Chauhan, Advocate.
 Mr. Arun Walia, Advocate and Mr. Dinesh
 Nagar, Advocate for HUDA.

M.M. AGGARWAL,J

On behalf of HUDA, it is stated that ownership of the house has since been transferred by HUDA in favour of Sheela Devi.

The facts of the case are that the plaintiffs, now petitioners had filed suit for declaration that they were owners in possession of the house No.663, Sector 12, Panchkula. In that suit, an application U/o 39 Rule 1 & 2 CPC was filed for restraining the defendants from interfering in the peaceful possession of the plaintiffs-petitioners on that house during the

pendency of the suit. That application was dismissed by the trial Court vide order dated 9.8.2005. Petitioners filed appeal, which was dismissed by Additional District Judge, Panchkula vide order dated 16.5.2006.

On behalf of the petitioners, reliance is being placed on certain documents showing that the plaintiffs-petitioners are in possession.

However, I find that there is concurrent findings of two courts below. Suit is pending since 2005 in the trial Court and stated to be fixed for evidence.

After hearing counsel for the parties, it is directed that the trial Court shall hold expeditious trial of the case. It shall give short dates to the plaintiffs and the defendants and shall conclude their evidence and then shall make all out efforts to conclude the trial within a period of six months.

With this observation, petition stands disposed of.

February 13, 2007
manoj

(M.M. AGGARWAL)
JUDGE